



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in these numerous inscriptions; but not one can be produced indicative of such a practice.

We notice the above particulars because they are those which, if held by the Church of the catacombs, would most naturally find expression in the epitaphs of the dead; for, of course, it is not to be expected that monumental inscriptions would contain any elaborate discussion of doctrine, or, perhaps, allude in any way to many of the more abstruse mysteries of the Christian religion. The doctrine of transubstantiation, even if held by the primitive Church, would, we admit, hardly find a place amongst these records of the dead. On the other hand, it may be safely asserted that there is not one of those peculiar doctrines or practices which the reformed Churches allege to have been imposed on the Christian world by the usurped authority of the Roman Pontiffs, that finds the slightest support or recognition amongst these records of the early Church. Nor is this all—higher purposes still are served by the examination of these monuments, inasmuch as they express the feelings of the great body of Christians whose leaders alone are known to us in history. The Fathers of the Church live in their voluminous works—the lower orders are only represented by their simple records. And it may, perhaps, be safely asserted that their ancient Church appears in the gallery of the Vatican in a more favourable light than in the writings of those Fathers or historians. It may be that the sepulchral tablet is more congenial to the display of pious feeling than the controversial epistle, or even the much-needed episcopal rebuke. Besides the gentle and amiable character and spirit everywhere breathed, the distinctive character of these remains is essentially Christian. The name of Christ is repeated in an endless number of forms, and the actions of his life are figured with every degree of rudeness of execution. The second person of the Trinity is neither viewed in the light of a temporal Messiah, nor degraded to the estimate of a mere example; but is invested with all the honours of a Redeemer. On this subject there is no reserve, no heathenish suppression of the distinguishing feature of our religion. On stones innumerable appears the Good Shepherd, bearing on his shoulders the recovered sheep, by which many an illiterate believer expressed his sense of personal salvation. One, according to his epitaph, "sleeps in Christ;" another is buried with a prayer that "she may live in the Lord Jesus." One has his sepulchre sealed with the inscription, "Christ is God," happy in not having to learn that truth when his sepulchre shall be rent asunder. But, most of all, the cross, in its simplest form, is employed to testify the faith of the deceased. Indeed we have but to examine these records of the early Roman Church to find out that its past and present can in no way be identified, and that we gain nothing in resemblance to the Church of the catacombs by a movement towards modern Rome. That persecuted Church which in the early ages of Christianity fought and triumphed in the cause of Christ has, in truth, no affinity with that proud and intolerant Church which has deluged with martyr blood every country in Europe, which has cursed our forefathers, and retains in full force against ourselves every anathema she ever pronounced against them.

TRUE AND FALSE MIRACLES.

CARDINAL BELLARMINI, in his enumeration of the "Notes of the True Church," reckons the power of working miracles among the number. "The eleventh mark of the Church," he says, "is the glory of miracles." "This note," he continues, "rests upon two foundations—the one, that miracles are necessary for the confirmation of a new doctrine; the other, that they are efficacious and sufficient. From the first principle we deduce that the true faith cannot be among our adversaries; from the second, that it exists among ourselves."

It is not our intention to discuss the validity of the two principles here laid down by the learned Cardinal—as, with some limitations, they represent pretty nearly the opinions of most Protestant divines. There is no doubt that both the Jewish and Christian dispensations, at their first promulgation, were accompanied and attested by a series of extraordinary and stupendous miracles; and, upon this point, all fair readers of the Bible, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, are agreed. It is not quite so clear, however, whether miracles alone, and considered merely by themselves, are sufficient to establish the truth of a divine revelation. It appears possible, for anything we know to the contrary, that evil spirits may be permitted by God to perform supernatural prodigies, for the purpose of leading mankind astray. Our Blessed Lord forewarned his disciples that, "in the last days, false prophets shall rise, and shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect."—Mark xiii. 22. And St. John, in the Revelation, when describing the second beast that was to arise in after times, represents him as "doing great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven

on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell in the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do."—Rev. xiii. 13, 14. These passages sufficiently show that miraculous signs, taken by themselves, cannot be regarded as sufficient to establish the truth of a revelation, independently of all consideration of the nature of the doctrines which that revelation contains.

But we hasten to consider the two conclusions which Cardinal Bellarmine deduces from the principles he had laid down. "From the first principle," he says, "we deduce that the true faith cannot be among our adversaries." He means, we suppose, to assert, that no Church can be a true Church which does not possess the power of working miracles; and, therefore, as no Reformed Church claims to possess this power, Protestants cannot be members of the one true Church of Christ.

Now, we beg leave to enter a decided protest against the misapplication which the learned Cardinal here makes of the principle which he himself laid down. "Miracles," he says, "are necessary for the confirmation of a new faith." So far we agree with him. But although miracles may be necessary, when a new religion is for the first time promulgated to the world, this fact by no means proves that they must be always necessary. We are as earnest as Cardinal Bellarmine in upholding the truth of the miracles wrought by our Blessed Lord and his apostles, for confirming the truth of Christianity. But when the Christian Church had been firmly established in the world, we do not see that there was any necessity for a further display of miraculous power. We find it nowhere stated in Scripture that the Christian Church was always to possess within itself the power of working miracles. Protestants now profess to believe the same doctrines which were preached by St. Peter and St. Paul; they hold the "faith which was once delivered to the saints."—Jude 3. If the miracles by which the first preaching of the Gospel was accompanied were true miracles, the evidence which they afforded to the early Christians ought to satisfy us. If we believe the Bible, we must be satisfied of the truth of the miracles then wrought; and, therefore, we must believe the faith which those miracles were intended to confirm. Protestants have added no new doctrine to the Christian faith, as the Church of Rome has lately done. When the Church of England and Ireland thinks fit to promulgate a new dogma, which is not to be found in Scripture, and was not taught by the early Church, and when she requires all her members to assent to it on pain of forfeiting their everlasting salvation, it will be time enough to demand of her to attest her claim by miraculous evidence—but not till then.

We have thought it right to make these few brief remarks on the unfair and illogical application which we conceive Bellarmine to have made of his own fundamental principle. Until he can show that it is essential to a true Church to possess the power of working miracles, he has no right to conclude that those who dissent from the Church of Rome cannot belong to the true Church, because they do not claim to possess this power. Roman Catholic controversialists have sometimes put the question in a taunting way to members of the Protestant communion—"Can you show us any miracles that ever were wrought in testimony of the truth of your religion?" The observations we have already made will, we think, furnish our readers with a satisfactory reply to this question. The religion which we now hold is that same holy Christian religion which was taught by our blessed Saviour and his apostles; and, therefore, all those miracles which they anciently wrought in confirmation of their doctrine do at this day confirm ours also, which, inasmuch as it is the same with theirs, needs no fresh or additional confirmation. When our first Reformers rejected those Romish errors which had overlaid and corrupted the ancient Christian doctrines, as they needed no extraordinary commission for their reformation, no more did they need any miracles to confirm their commission. And when, after removing those abuses which in latter times had crept into the Church, they preached the pure doctrines of that primitive Gospel, which had been abundantly confirmed already by mighty signs and wonders, it is plain that they no more needed any new miracles than if such errors and abuses had never been brought in.

But we must now proceed to consider Cardinal Bellarmine's next assertion—namely, that the existence of miracles within the Church of Rome proves her to be the true Church of Christ. Now, even if, for the sake of argument, we should grant that real, unquestionable miracles were performed within the bosom of the Romish Church, yet a moment's consideration will show that it would by no means follow from thence that the Church of Rome was the only true Church. For example, in the time of the prophet Elijah (1 Kings), who wrought such astonishing miracles—who called down fire from heaven, and raised a man from the dead—we know that the Israelitish Church in Samaria was so fearfully corrupt, that there were but 7,000 persons who had not fallen into gross idolatry. True miracles prove that the individual who performs them acts under divine direction in that particular message which he delivers; but they do not prove that either he, or the body to which he may belong, are, in all respects, infallibly true.

But, then, the important question arises—are the miracles of which the Church of Rome tells us so much, really true, or are they not? If they are, then, doubtless, they demand our serious and reverent attention. However strange or improbable the circumstances connected with any supposed miracle may appear, yet, if we are once satisfied that a miracle has actually taken place, all seeming objections arising from its antecedent improbability are at once silenced.

Now, it is needless for us to undertake to demonstrate in detail the absurdity of many of the miraculous stories to which the Church of Rome has given her sanction, and which she has even introduced into her public services; for this is fully acknowledged by many learned and impartial writers of that communion. Peter, Abbot of Cluny, had the honesty, even so far back as the twelfth century, to complain of these lying legends. "You know," saith he, in an epistle to one of his friends, "how irksome these false hymns in the Church of God must needs be to me."* And a little after, in the same epistle, he adds, that "he had found, at least, four and twenty lies in one hymn of Benedict."† Lindanus, another learned writer, cites a bishop of Lyons, who states, that he had corrected the Antiphonary, "having cut off many things which seemed superfluous, trivial, false, blasphemous, and fantastical;"‡ and then Lindanus adds, in his own person, that if that bishop had lived to see the Missals in his days, "*Deum immortalem! quo ea nomine pingeret?*" Good God! by what name would he have described them? We are told also by Melchior Canus, one of the most eminent of the Roman Catholic Canonists, "that he cannot deny but that even their best writers, especially in describing the miracles of the saints, have gathered up scattered rumours, and transferred them to posterity in their writings, herein too much indulging themselves, or the ordinary sort of believers, whom they supposed not only ready to believe, but also vehemently desirous of such miracles."§ When the great majority of people are so prone to credulity, as to be willing to yield implicit credence to scattered reports, and to be vehemently desirous of new miracles, it requires but little experience to predict that they will never want writers willing to gratify their taste for the marvellous and improbable. Whether such legends, however, are to be classed among Cardinal Bellarmine's "Notes of the Church," or among the "lying wonders" which are to characterize the apostasy of the latter days, (2. Thes. ii. 9) we leave all impartial readers to decide.

But let us come down a little nearer to our own times. It may be said that we have no adequate means of knowing the truth or falsehood of the reputed miracles of the dark ages. Be it so. But surely we ought to be able to judge of the truth of such as are said to be performed in the present time. Cardinal Bellarmine, as we have seen, goes the length of asserting, that the true Church must possess the power of working miracles. If so, then Protestants may surely ask, are there any clear, well-attested miracles wrought in the Church of Rome in our own day? If there are, let us be informed of them; if not, what becomes of Cardinal Bellarmine's mark of the true Church?

We fear we may search in vain the history of the modern Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, for even the semblance of a miracle. Whether it be that Irish Romanists have now grown "cold in the faith," and do not deserve to have a miracle performed amongst them—or whether the close proximity of inquisitive Protestants holds out but little chance of establishing a general belief in a miracle upon insufficient grounds—certain it is that few such attempts have been made in our own days, and that Ireland enjoys the unenviable distinction of being almost the only country professing allegiance to the See of Rome, which cannot boast of a modern miracle.||

When we turn our eyes to France, we do not meet with much greater success. Those of our readers who have read the history of the miracle of La Salette, given in our last number, will there find a most instructive example of the way in which the story of a miracle may be got up. In this case the imposture was so cleverly managed that it deceived the Roman Catholic Bishop of Grenoble, along with a large proportion of the people of his diocese; and we doubt not that there are great numbers of Romanists, not only in France, but even in England, who are still ready to fix their faith upon one of the most audacious acts of fraud and mendacity that ever imposed upon the credulity of an unthinking age.

Spain is the next Roman Catholic country which invites our notice. Here, at least, there are no heretics to infuse doubts into the minds of the faithful and obedient subjects of the Pope, or, if any such do exist, they are compelled, by the strong arm of the law, to keep their doubts to themselves. Accordingly, we find that there is no lack of

* *Nesci quantum me pegerant falsa in Ecclesia Dei cantica.*—Pet. Abbas Cluniacensis, l. v., Epist. 89.

† *Mendacia ad minus viginti quatuor, canticum id citato percurrere animo, reperit.*—Epist. 89, ut supra.

‡ *Amputatis quæ superflua, levia, falsa, blasphemosa, phantastica, mente videbantur.*—Lindanus, de interpretandis Scripturis, lib. iii., cap. iii.

§ *Quamquam negare non possumus, viros aliquando gravissimos, &c.* Melch. Canus, Loc. Theol. lib. xi., cap. 2.

|| The only modern attempt to get up a miracle in Ireland is, we believe, the case of the Ecstacy of Youghal, in 1842, which may still be in the recollection of some of our readers. We have the published account of it, and may, probably, on some other occasion, record the substance of it for the edification of our readers.

* Undecima nota est gloria miraculorum: sunt autem duo fundamenta præmittenda. Unum, quod miracula sint necessaria ad novam fidem, vel extraordinariam missionem prædicandam; alterum, quod sint efficacia ad sufficientiam. Nam ex primo deducimus, non esse apud adversarios veram fidem; posteriori deducimus, eam esse apud nos. Bellarm. de Notis Ecclesie, lib. iv., cap. xiv., vol. ii., p. 84. Colon, 1615.

modern Spanish miracles. We copy from a Dublin paper of the last month* an account of one of the most recent of these "notes of the true Church."

"Within the last few days (May 18) a report was spread in Madrid, that a figure of the Saviour, in the Church of St. Francisco the Great, sweated blood and water out of grief for the sale of the church property! Forthwith the people thronged to the place to behold the miracle, and there was much excitement. Some of the faithful and credulous were heard to declare that they had wiped the exudations from the countenance of the graven image, whose eyes and mouth others imagined they saw move. The ferment was such that the authorities were obliged to clear the square in front of the church, and some soldiers removed the figure from its niche, as no workmen could be got to do it. It need hardly be said, that neither the soldiers, nor officers who commanded them, detected any supernatural appearance in the image."

On reading this story we were at once reminded of a similar event which took place in the Cathedral of Christ's Church, Dublin, about the time of the Reformation. As the authenticity of the narrative is unquestionable, and the matter excited considerable interest at the time, we think many of our readers will be glad to have an opportunity of comparing it with the Spanish miracle of our own day.

When Queen Elizabeth succeeded to the throne of England, in November, 1558, one of the first measures adopted by the new government, with reference to the Irish Church, was the restoration of the use of the Church service in English as it had been adopted in the reign of Edward VI. The prospect of a revival of the reformed worship was little pleasing to the more bigoted of the Romish party, who were ready to go any length, or have recourse to any expedient, rather than resign, without a struggle, the use of the Latin Mass. Something must be done, now or never, to keep up the reputation of the old superstition; and a miracle appeared the most suitable expedient.

On Sunday, September 3, 1559, the Lord Lieutenant, (Sir Anthony St. Leger), the Archbishop of Dublin, and the rest of the Privy Council, were assembled in Christ's Church Cathedral, and the Litany was sung in English, as part of the divine service. "There was in that Cathedral" (we copy the words of the historian, Strype)† "an image of Christ in marble, standing with a reed in his hand, and the crown of thorns on his head. And, while service was saying before this great assembly, blood was seen to run through the crevices of the crown of thorns, trickling down the face of the crucifix. The people did not perceive it at first; therefore, some, who were in the fraud, cried out to one another, and bade them see how our Saviour's image sweat blood! Whereat several of the common people fell down with their beads in their hands, and prayed to the image. Vast numbers flocked to the sight, and one present, who, indeed, was the contriver, and formerly belonged to the priory of this cathedral, told the people the cause—namely, 'That he could not choose but sweat blood, while heresy was then come into this church.' The confusion hereupon was so great that the assembly broke up; but the people still fell upon their knees, thumping their breasts."

"But the Archbishop of Dublin, being displeased, caused a form to be brought out of the choir, and bade the sexton of the church to stand thereon, and to scrub and wash the image to see if it would bleed afresh. The man soon perceived the cheat, observing a sponge within the hollow of the image's head. This sponge, one Leigh, sometime a monk of this cathedral, had soaked in a bowl of blood, and, early on Sunday morning, watching his opportunity, placed the said sponge, so swollen and heavy with blood, over the image's head within the crown; and so, by little and little, the blood soaked through upon the face. The sponge was presently brought down, and showed to these worshippers; and some of them arrested Father Leigh, who was soon discovered, and three or four others that had been contrivers with him."

"The Archbishop, the next Sunday, preached in the same church, before the Lord Lieutenant and the council, upon the text (2 Thess. ii. 11)—'God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie;' exposing the cheats, who openly stood there with Father Leigh, upon a table before the pulpit, with their hands and legs tied, and their crime written upon their breasts. This punishment they suffered three Sundays, were imprisoned for some time, and then banished the realm. This converted above one hundred persons present, who swore they would never hear Mass more."

We make no apology for the length of the foregoing interesting and instructive extract; and we are sure that our readers will at once perceive how closely it resembles the recent Spanish miracle of the 18th of last May. In both cases the priests had a direct personal motive for their conduct. In Ireland, they wished to retain the old Latin liturgy; in Spain, they wanted to prevent the sale of the Church lands. In both cases the pretended miracle was precisely the same—namely, the production of the appearance of drops of blood upon the face of an image of our Saviour. In Dublin, the energy and sagacity of Archbishop Curwen at once detected the imposture; and, doubtless, if the present Archbishop of Madrid had been a man of the same stamp, the exposure of the Spanish miracle would have been just as crushing and complete. It is

one of the proud boasts of the Church of Rome that she is *unchangeable*. In one respect we are ready to acknowledge that there is some truth in the assertion—she is unchangeable in the devices she has recourse to, in order to impose upon the credulity of mankind.

We have not space to discuss the notable modern miracle of the winking image of the Virgin at Rimini, or any other of the stories of the same class which abound in every part of Italy. On some future occasion we may return to the subject. Meanwhile, we request our readers seriously to consider how far a Church, professing to be guided by a love of truth and sincerity, can be justified in having recourse to such deliberate fraud and imposture. We have seen that this is no new practice of the Church of Rome. From the twelfth century downwards, honest and impartial writers have complained of the atmosphere of falsehood and deceit which hung, like a thick cloud, over the religious services of the Church of Rome. To this day the Romish divines do not venture to defend the absurd legends of their own Breviary, many of which we have recently exposed at length in former numbers of this journal. Now, what defence can be offered for these lying legends and false miracles? If the rulers of the Church of Rome were really in earnest in their professed love of truth, they could have no difficulty in rooting out of their system all such "refuges of lies." If, according to the laws of our realm, the forgery of the Queen's signature justly subjects the offender to a heavy punishment, what shall we think of the conduct of those persons who take part in, or give countenance to, the perpetration of a false miracle, which is nothing less than a wicked attempt to give to a lie the attestation of the God of Truth? And if, in fine, the gift of miracles claimed by Bellarmine for his Church, is to be estimated by the specimens which we have indifferently selected from France, Spain, and Ireland, we think the learned Cardinal has no reason to pride himself on *such notes of the true Church*.

THE HISTORY OF THE DOUAY BIBLE.

THE history of the Douay Bible, and the various steps and attempts by which it has been brought to its present state, has lately received an elucidation more full and complete than we had hoped ever to possess.

The Ven. Henry Cotton, Archdeacon of Cashel, has published a work, entitled "RHEMES AND DOUAY—an attempt to show what has been done by Roman Catholics for the Diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in English." Oxford, 1855.

The importance of such a work is very great. The Church of Rome claims to have sole power of giving the true sense of Scripture. She boasts that to her it belongs to judge of translations and supply interpretation. What can be more important than to be able to know how the Church of Rome has fulfilled her duty in this respect?

We have, from time to time, called attention to this subject; but we have felt deeply how much remains to be done before this subject could be fully treated. We felt the necessity of the various and successive editions being collected and arranged before the history of the Douay Bible could be fully known; and we hardly hoped to see so great a task efficiently performed.

The manner in which this task has been performed by Dr. Cotton is deserving of admiration. With vast labour he has collected all the editions, and noted their several peculiarities, both in the text and the notes, and also the "approbations" given to each.

The tone and temper of Dr. Cotton's work is equally deserving of approval. He has, of course, to give quotations in which Roman Catholics and Protestants say very hard things of each other; but all that is written by Dr. Cotton himself is precisely in that temper which we desire to maintain—giving credit where credit is due, and speaking with moderation where censure is required.

We invite the attention of the Roman Catholic priests to Dr. Cotton's work. We trust they will feel their obligation to a Protestant clergyman, who has given them what they must feel was wanting—a history of their own translation of the Bible.

The book is not the less valuable from Dr. Cotton having confined himself to ascertaining facts—"My chief object has been to ascertain facts, to supply correct information, to collect and arrange materials, from which my readers may be enabled to draw their own conclusions, and to pursue the subject, if they choose, to the full extent which its importance may be thought to justify. All which I propose to do here is to exhibit the present state of the Roman Catholic Bible in these countries, and to trace the successive steps and stages by which it has been brought to that condition."

Our readers may remember an article in our number for June, 1853, in which we showed in what a vast number of places the Douay Bibles now in use differ from the Douay Bibles first published, and the importance of many of the alterations. We then stated our inability to give a full history of all these changes. But all this has been cleared up by Dr. Cotton's labours. We cannot, of course, go through his observations on each separate edition, many of which were mere reprints of former editions, but Dr. Cotton gives a classification of

the various Roman Catholic translations and editions—viz. :—

I. Those which have been published by authority.

II. Those put forth by individuals.

Among the former he reckons—(1) Rhemish Testament, published in 1582, 1600, 1621, 1633, 1738, 1788, 1789.

(2) Douay Bible (Old Testament), published in 1609-10, and again in 1635, and never since.

(3) Dr. Challoner's revised Old Testament, published in 1750, and often since reprinted.

(4) Dr. Challoner's New Testament; first edition, 1749; second edition, 1750; third edition, 1752. The second of these editions differed from the first in 124 places. The third differed from the first in more than 2,000 places (p. 49).

Dr. Cotton classifies other later editions, which are not without interest, but the above are the most important, because Dr. Challoner's second edition of the Old Testament, and his third edition of the New Testament, are the basis of all the Roman Catholic translations now in circulation, although several of the editions in circulation still differ more or less from each other; but to Dr. Challoner belongs the credit of the greater number of differences between the old and modern Roman Catholic Bibles, which we noticed in our number for June, 1853.

The things which have been most insisted upon by Roman Catholics respecting translations of the Scripture have been—(1) approbation by the authority of the Church; (2) notes directing to the true sense of Scripture. The facts collected by Dr. Cotton are most important in both respects.

Dr. Cotton gives the "approbations" prefixed to each addition, with a table of all the "approbations," in page 172.

From this table it appears that up to the year 1783—that is, until seventy-two years ago—no edition of the Roman Catholic Bible ever had the approbation of a Roman Catholic bishop prefixed to it; up to that time the "approbations" or recommendations were all from Roman Catholic divines, who were *not* bishops.

It further appears that Dr. Challoner's editions of the Old Testament had no "approbation" from either divines or bishops. Dr. Challoner's first edition of the New Testament, published in 1749, had an "approbation" from two divines, but not from any bishop. His second edition had none. His third edition, which differed in 2,000 places from his first, and which is the basis of all the modern editions, had none! The modern Roman Catholic Bibles have, therefore, sprung from the learned labour, the private judgment, of an individual bishop, and though subsequent bishops have given to his translation an "approbation" which the bishops of his own time did *not* give, yet they also acted on their private judgment; there is no English translation of the Scripture authorized by the Church of Rome; the approbation of Roman Catholic bishops is a late invention, only seventy years old, and does not give the authority of the Church of Rome to the translations so approved; for if there were an "authorized translation" of the Church of Rome, how could Bishop Kenrick have made a new one in 1849?

There is much more in Dr. Cotton's book, which shows of how little value or weight these "approbations" are; but we must be content for the present with the foregoing, which is quite enough to prove that there is no English translation of the Bible authorized by the Church of Rome, and that the Douay translation, as it now stands, is the fruit of "private judgment."

The same conclusion is true of the notes in the Douay Bible. Nearly all the original notes have been rejected. The present notes in the Douay Bible have nothing to rest on, but the *private judgment* of persons whose names even we often do not know. We quote from Dr. Cotton's book, p. 167, the evidence given by Dr. Doyle before a committee of the House of Lords, A.D. 1825—"The notes carry, in our editions of the Bible, no weight, for we do not know the writers of many of them. If we find them clear enough in explanation of doctrine, we leave them there; but whenever we find anything exceptionable, we put it out" (Report, &c). Dr. Cotton's brief comment upon this appears to us to be very forcible—"It is difficult to prevent the question from continually recurring to one's mind—that if notes are of *no authority* and *no weight*, what is the paramount necessity (as alleged) for their being always appended to the text?"

We shall often have to recur to Dr. Cotton's valuable labours, and we recommend his book to all who are desirous of knowing the history and authority of the Douay Bible, with a strong conviction that the perusal of it will tend to lead intelligent Roman Catholics to a more fearless and diligent study of Holy Scripture.

LA SALETTE.

(Continued from page 67.)

On the evening of the 19th September the two shepherds described the apparition of the beautiful lady to their respective masters, who treated it very lightly, Melanie's declaring that he attached no faith to the recital (Verité, p. 46), and Maximin's master not even taking the trouble to accompany the two children to the curé's house, when they went there the next day, Sunday, the 20th, before Mass, to tell the whole to the curé. So little did he mind what he

* Vide Daily Express, May 26, 1855.

† Strype, life of Archbishop Parker, vol. I., p. 90. Oxford edition.